

REMARKS

We have carefully considered the Office Action dated June 7, 2007, in which allowable subject matter is found in claims 89-96 and the remaining claims are rejected as either anticipated by or obvious over United States Patent 5,428,342 to Enoki et al.

The Enoki patent describes a system in which the current utilized by simultaneously operating household appliances is analyzed to determine if respective appliances are on or off and/or if any appliance is operating in a manner that differs from its usual operating manner, and thus, operating in a manner that warrants an alarm being sounded. The Enoki patent specifically teaches away from separately monitoring the operations of each appliance in favor of its simultaneous monitoring of the appliances. See, col. 1, ll. 53-60. Thus, the Enoki patent teaches away from the monitoring device of the current invention, which is connected between a source of electric energy for a given household electric user and the electric load of that electric user, as set forth in claim 47 as amended. The language pointing to how the monitoring device is connected has been moved from the preamble of the independent claim 47 to the body of the claim, to more particularly point out the operation of the monitoring device. Accordingly, the claim, as amended, should be allowable over the Enoki reference.

There are further differences between the Enoki system and the current invention. One difference is that the Enoki system must be "trained" in order to retain power spectra that represent the operations of the respective appliances that are to be monitored. To

train the system, Enoki operates a single appliance, monitors the current drawn by that appliance over time, converts the monitored current to a power spectrum and stores the results in a memory, and does the same for each of the appliances to be monitored. See, col. 5, ll. 38 et seq. Thereafter, the Enoki system monitors the current drawn by the household, converts the monitored current to power spectra and determines whether those power spectra match the stored values obtained through the training. If the power spectra do not "quite coincide" with the stored power spectra, an alarm signal is generated. See, col. 4, ll. 32-37.

Thus, the Enoki system does not show a memory that **retains reference data or profiles of electric power or current that are absorbed during operating cycles of a corresponding type of electric user** as set forth in claim 47. Instead, Enoki trains its device in order to obtain reference data or profiles based on the operations of the very appliances that are being monitored. Thus, the Enoki system determines on/off and alarm status based on the reference current levels drawn during the training session, and the levels may or may not represent fault-free performance. In contrast, the invention determines its status information based on reference current levels drawn by a corresponding type of electric user, which presumably is operating in a fault-free manner.

The distinction in using data that relates to **a corresponding type of electric user** versus the actual electric user is important. For example, the current system determines overall efficiency information (claim 48) and/or wear information (claim 49), based on the reference data or profiles of the corresponding type of electric user. The Enoki

system can only determine if the respective appliances are operating as they have in the past, and thus, the Enoki system can not compare the power spectra associated with the operations of the respective appliances to those of theoretical levels of operation of corresponding appliances, as set forth in, for example, dependent claim 50.

The arguments set forth above apply also to independent method claim 68 and the claims that depend therefrom, as well as independent multiple-monitor system claim 85 and the claims that depend therefrom.

We do not specifically address the Examiner's rejections of additional claims that depend from claim 47 and the corresponding claims that depend from independent claims 68 and 85. This should not be construed as acquiescence to the rejections, but as recognition that the rejections are moot based on our remarks regarding the allowability of the independent claim 47 as amended and claims 68 and 85.

The claims, as amended, should now be in form for allowance. We ask that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of claims 47-87 and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If the Examiner is to issue an Office Action in which all pending claims are not allowed, we ask, in advance, that the Examiner contact the undersigned for an interview.

PATENTS
108041-0009
ME020

Please charge any fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account

No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Patricia A. Sheehan", written over a horizontal line.

Patricia A. Sheehan

Reg. No. 32,301

CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP

88 Black Falcon Avenue

Boston, MA 02210-2414

(617) 951-2500